UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/773,646 | 02/05/2004 | Ashok Mantravadi | 030262 | 7644 |

23696 7590 04/10/2008
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| YUN, EUGENE | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2618 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/10/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/773,646 | MANTRAVADI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | EUGENE YUN | 2618 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 35 and 36 fail to fall within a statutory category of invention. They are directed to the instructions themselves, not a process occurring as a result of executing the instructions, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the instructions nor a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the instructions in a manner which enables the program to act as a computer component and realize its functionality. It's also clearly not directed to a composition of matter. Therefore they are non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 12-14, 17-22, and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowalewki (US 7,155,165) in view of Walker et al. (US 7,215,713).

Referring to Claim 1, Kowalewki teaches a method of recovering first and second data streams transmitted simultaneously via a wireless channel in a wireless communication system (see col. 4, lines 21-23), comprising:

deriving a first channel estimate for the wireless channel based on received symbols (see col. 7, lines 35-38);

performing detection for the first data stream using the first channel estimate (see col. 3, lines 13-18);

deriving a second channel estimate based on the detected first data stream (see col. 7, lines 38-41);

deriving a third channel estimate based on the first and second channel estimates (see col. 6, lines 27-38); and

performing detection for the second data stream using the third channel estimate (see col. 4, lines 41-47).

Kowalewki does not teach the second data stream as an enhancement of the first data stream. Walker teaches the second data stream as an enhancement of the first data stream (see col. 10, lines 22-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Walker to said device of Kowalewki in order to be able to increase the capacity of data transmitted in the data streams.

Claim 30 has similar limitations as Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 2, Kowalewki also teaches the first channel estimate for the wireless channel is derived based on received pilot symbols (see col. 7, lines 35-38).

Referring to Claims 3 and 31, Kowalewki also teaches estimating interference due to the first data stream using the third channel estimate, and wherein the detection for the second data stream is performed with the estimated interference from the first data stream canceled (see col. 6, lines 27-38).

Referring to Claim 4, Kowalewki also teaches the first and second data streams are combined prior to transmission via the wireless channel (see 80 in fig. 2).

Referring to Claim 5, Kowalewki also teaches deriving the first channel estimate including obtaining a frequency response estimate for the wireless channel based on the received pilot symbols (see col. 6, lines 54-56),

deriving a time-domain impulse response estimate for the wireless channel based on the frequency response estimate (see col. 8, lines 24-27), and

deriving the first channel estimate based on the time-domain impulse response estimate (see col. 10, lines 62-66).

Referring to Claim 7, Kowalewki also teaches deriving the second channel estimate including obtaining a frequency response estimate for the wireless channel based on the received pilot symbols (see col. 7, lines 38-41),

deriving a time-domain impulse response estimate for the wireless channel based on the frequency response estimate (see col. 8, lines 24-27), and

deriving the first channel estimate based on the time-domain impulse response estimate (see col. 10, lines 62-66).

Referring to Claim 8, Kowalewki also teaches the first and second channel estimates as time-domain impulse response estimates, and wherein the third channel estimate is a frequency response estimate derived by combining and transforming the time-domain impulse response estimates for the first and second channel estimates (see col. 8, lines 24-47).

Referring to Claim 12, Kowalewki also teaches the detection for the first data stream performed on received data symbols and provides detected symbols for the first data stream (see col. 3, lines 31-18).

Referring to Claims 13 and 32, Kowalewki also teaches decoding the detected symbols for the first data stream to obtain decoded data for the first data stream, and re-encoding the decoded data to obtain remodulated symbols for the first data stream, and wherein the second channel estimate is derived based on the remodulated symbols and the received data symbols (see col. 6, lines 14-27).

Referring to Claim 14, Kowalewki also teaches mapping the detected symbols for the first data stream to modulation symbols based on a modulation scheme used for the first data stream, and wherein the second channel estimate is derived based on the modulation symbols and the received data symbols (see col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 8).

Referring to Claim 17, Kowalewki also teaches filtering the first channel estimate, and wherein the third channel estimate is derived based on the filtered first channel estimate (see col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 14).

Referring to Claim 18, Kowalewki also teaches filtering the second channel estimate, and wherein the third channel estimate is derived based on the filtered second channel estimate (see col. 12, lines 45-67).

Referring to Claim 19, Kowalewki also teaches filtering the third channel estimate, and wherein the detection for the second data stream is performed using the filtered third channel estimate (see col. 12, lines 45-67).

Referring to Claim 20, Kowalewki also teaches filtering the first, second, or third channel estimate in time domain or frequency domain (see col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 14).

Referring to Claim 21, Kowalewki also teaches an infinite impulse response filter (see col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 14 noting that an IIR filter is well known in the art).

Referring to Claim 22, Kowalewki also teaches a finite impulse response filter (see col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 14 noting that an FIR filter is well known in the art).

Referring to Claim 27, Kowalewki teaches an apparatus operable to recover first and second data streams transmitted simultaneously via a wireless channel in a wireless communication system (see col. 4, lines 21-23), comprising:

a channel estimator operative to derive a first channel estimate for the wireless channel based on received symbols (see col. 7, lines 35-38), derive a second channel estimate based on detected symbols for the first data stream (see col. 7, lines 38-41), and derive a third channel estimate based on the first and second channel estimates (see col. 6, lines 27-38); and

a detector operative to perform detection for the first data stream using the first channel estimate (see col. 3, lines 13-18), provide the detected symbols for the first data stream, perform detection for the second data stream using the third channel estimate, and provide detected symbols for the second data stream (see col. 4, lines 41-47).

Kowalewki does not teach the second data stream as an enhancement of the first data stream. Walker teaches the second data stream as an enhancement of the first data stream (see col. 10, lines 22-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Walker to said device of Kowalewki in order to be able to increase the capacity of data transmitted in the data streams.

Referring to Claim 28, Kowalewki also teaches the detector further operative to estimate interference due to the first data stream using the third channel estimate and to perform detection for the second data stream with the estimated interference from the first data stream canceled (see col. 4, lines 41-47).

Referring to Claim 29, Kowalewki also teaches a receive data processor operative to decode the detected symbols for the first data stream to obtain decoded data for the first data stream and to re-encode the decoded data to obtain remodulated symbols for the first data stream, and wherein the channel estimator is operative to derive the second channel estimate based on the remodulated symbols and received data symbols (see col. 6, lines 14-27).

Referring to Claim 33, Kowalewki teaches a method of recovering a base stream and an enhancement stream transmitted simultaneously via a wireless channel in a wireless communication system (see col. 4, lines 21-23), comprising:

deriving a first channel estimate for the wireless channel based on received pilot symbols (see col. 7, lines 35-38);

performing detection for the base stream using the first channel estimate to obtain detected symbols for the base stream (see col. 3, lines 13-18);

decoding the detected symbols for the base stream to obtain decoded data for the base stream (see col. 4, lines 38-40);

re-encoding the decoded data for the base stream to obtain remodulated symbols for the base stream (see col. 6, lines 14-27);

deriving a second channel estimate based on the remodulated symbols (see col. 7, lines 38-41);

deriving a third channel estimate based on the first and second channel estimates (see col. 6, lines 27-38);

estimating interference due to the base stream using the third channel estimate (see col. 6, lines 54-56);

performing detection for the enhancement stream, with the estimated interference from the base stream canceled and using the third channel estimate, to obtain detected symbols for the enhancement stream; and decoding the detected symbols for the enhancement stream to obtain decoded data for the enhancement stream (see col. 4, lines 41-47).

Kowalewki does not teach the enhancement stream as an enhancement stream of the base stream. Walker teaches the enhancement stream as an enhancement stream of the base stream (see col. 10, lines 22-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Walker to said device of Kowalewki in order to be able to increase the capacity of data transmitted in the data streams.

Referring to Claim 34, Kowalewki also teaches deriving the first channel estimate including obtaining a frequency response estimate for the wireless channel based on the received pilot symbols (see col. 6, lines 54-56),

deriving a time-domain impulse response estimate for the wireless channel based on the frequency response estimate (see col. 8, lines 24-27), and

deriving the first channel estimate based on the time-domain impulse response estimate (see col. 10, lines 62-66).

4. Claims 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowalewki and Walker and in view of Cioffi et al. (US 5,995,567).

Referring to Claim 6, the combination of Kowalewki and Walker does not teach the time-domain impulse response estimate derived by performing an inverse fast Fourier transform (IFFF) on the frequency response estimate, and wherein the first channel estimate is derived by performing a fast Fourier transform (FFF) on the time-domain impulse response estimate. Cioffi teaches the time-domain impulse response estimate derived by performing an inverse fast Fourier transform (IFFF) on the

frequency response estimate, and wherein the first channel estimate is derived by performing a fast Fourier transform (FFF) on the time-domain impulse response estimate (see col. 1, lines 44-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Cioffi to the modified device of Kowalewki and Walker in order to better compensate for RF interference.

Referring to Claim 9, Cioffi also teaches the first channel estimate comprising channel gain estimates for a first group of subbands and the second channel estimate comprises channel gain estimates for a second group of subbands, and wherein the third channel estimate is derived based on a concatenation of the channel gain estimates for the first and second groups of subbands (see col. 11, lines 18-22).

Referring to Claim 10, Cioffi also teaches the third channel estimate derived by frequency interpolation of the channel gain estimates for the first and second groups of subbands (see col. 8, lines 50-56).

Referring to Claim 11, Cioffi also teaches the first group of subbands is used for pilot transmission and the second group of subbands is used for data transmission (see col. 7, lines 8-14).

5. Claims 15, 16, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowalewki, Walker, and Cioffi and further in view of Isaksson et al. (US 6,181,714).

Referring to Claim 15, the combination of Kowalewki, Walker, and Cioffi does not teach the deriving a third channel estimate including scaling the first channel estimate with a first scaling factor, scaling the second channel estimate with a second scaling factor, and combining the scaled first channel estimate and the scaled second channel estimate to obtain the third channel estimate. Isaksson teaches the deriving a third channel estimate including scaling the first channel estimate with a first scaling factor, scaling the second channel estimate with a second scaling factor, and combining the scaled first channel estimate and the scaled second channel estimate to obtain the third channel estimate (see col. 2, lines 51-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Isaksson to the modified device of Kowalewki, Walker, and Cioffi in order to ensure better compatibility with high-bandwidth systems.

Refering to Claim 16, Isaksson also teaches the first and second scaling factors selected based on reliability of the first channel estimate relative to reliability of the second channel estimate (see col. 2, lines 51-67).

Refering to Claim 23, Isaksson also teaches the wireless communication system utilizing orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) (see col. 2, lines 40-45).

Referring to Claim 24, Isaksson also teaches the received pilot symbols are obtained in each OFDM symbol period and for a set of subbands used for pilot transmission (see col. 12, lines 13-24).

Referring to Claim 25, Isaksson also teaches the received pilot symbols are obtained for OFDM symbol periods used for pilot transmission, wherein the first channel estimate is derived for each OFDM symbol period used for pilot transmission, and wherein the second channel estimate is derived for each OFDM symbol period used for data transmission (see col. 12, lines 13-24).

Referring to Claim 26, Isaksson also teaches the wireless communication system as a multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) communication system, and wherein the first and second data streams are transmitted simultaneously from a plurality of antennas (see col. 9, lines 20-26).

### *Response to Arguments*

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EUGENE YUN whose telephone number is (571)272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eugene Yun
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2618

/E. Y./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Matthew D. Anderson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618